50
N25

..THE..

Biography of God

AS MEN HAVE TOLD IT

From---
FETCHISM
TO MONISM

DUREN J. H. WARD

BEHOLD the All-Enfolding Might;
The Sole Source, Substance, Life and Light!
Whose Being holds in unity
The Sun-beam, Moss and Galaxy;
Whose Ether-Pulse evolves the whole;
Whose Beauty, innate, thrills the soul;
Whose Order fills that soul with awe:
God—Spirit, Energy and Law.

Gen Lib

The University of Chicago
Libraries

GIFT OF

The Up the Divide Publishing Company

The Biography of God

AS MEN HAVE TOLD IT

From....
FETICHISM
TO MONISM

An Anthropological Sketch

From....
EARLY CREDULOUS
QUERY TO LATEST
VERIFIED FACT

BY

DUREN J. H. WARD

UP THE DIVIDE PUBLISHING CO.
958 Acoma St., Denver, Colo.

BL50
.W25

CONTENTS

	Page
Early Progress Compelled, Not Planned	5
Origin of Religion	7
Primitive Religions	8
Fetichism	11
Stone and Rock Worship	12
Tree Worship	14
Serpent Worship	16
Water Worship	17
Worship of the Heavens and of Heavenly Objects	18
Moral Education thru Religion	20
Value of Nature Worship	23
Influence of the Gods on Conduct	24
Forms and Creeds	25
Origin of Priesthood and Church	27
Mutual Influence of Church and State	31
Medical, Legal and Pedagogical Differentiation	33
Character and Its Basis	35
The Changing Content of Religion	37
Anthropomorphism	39
Social Reflexes on Primitive Theology	40
God Today—The New Monism	43
Finding The Real God at Last	45

HELPFUL READING

Peschel, The Races of Men.
Tylor, Primitive Culture, 2 vols.
Spencer, Ecclesiastical Institutions.
Romanes, Mental Evolution in Man.
Reed, Winwood, Martyrdom of Man.
Frazier, The Golden Bough.
Klaatsch, Evolution and Human Progress.
Robinson, Mind in the Making.
Haeckel, Monism.
Soddy, Matter, Motion and Energy.
Thomson, What is Man?

740275

PREFACE

The idea of God is perhaps man's largest generalization. It is learned by each very early. It is made the basis for other thought. Around it is built the world-outlook of every individual. It is not an instinct. It is learned. Each specific kind of god-idea is passed on by tradition in each nation or race. It is a matter of upper brain function. Instincts being earlier, probably function from the earlier or mid-brain. Religion grows sacred by unquestioned belief. It slowly falls into narrowness and greater error because the problem is so great and so dangerous.

Moreover, religions differ. Instincts are the same. Religions can be changed. Gods can be dethroned. New gods can be enthroned. But, like political revolutions, these are serious undertakings. Yet all intelligent and unvested people now know that development can take place and must, or the social order will break down.

But many people are yet living who believe and assert that there are no new realms of truth. They insist on being left undisturbed. They are bitter against the Columbuses for revealing new continents. They despise the Edisons for turning on electric lights. They are more comfortable under the blinking of tallow candles. They make much noise about being "loyal to the fathers" and being "safe and sane." They berate the thinkers who strive for progress. They forever reassure humanity that they alone possess reliability, and that to strive for change is not respectable. And yet, strange to say, they die and are forgotten. No one remembers who were the persecutors of Socrates or Jesus or Galilee. And soon no one will be able to recall the maligners of Darwin and Spencer and Haeckel and Lester Ward. Later generations remember with heroic devotion those who have enlarged their horizons.

And so it is in the matter of god-making. A great change is coming. The historical gods were what unenlightened imagina-

tions made them—nothing more, nothing less. They were characters in fiction, made to play parts they did not fit. They were never facts in history. Not one of them ever came near representing reality. They were always abstractions, paralleling human growth and interests, separate from human life, objectified and raised ever higher and higher above the world. At first they always meant ideals and better character to the people whose imagination created them. Later they always degenerated and became weak, wicked or indifferent after taking on the character of a commercialized hierarchy and an exploiting aristocracy. Thus they became useless as inspirers of life, and then new prophets and reformers arose—to be jeered at for a time, and to become triumphant authority later.

There was always present, in and around, before and behind, above and below the simple blindness of fore-time peoples, that Great All-Might, that Eternal Entity, that Omnipresent Cause, that Only Reality, which in almost no way corresponded to their primitive guesses and musings. Before the nineteenth century, not one in a hundred million ever glimpsed this Sole Actual God now revealed by Science.

Thus men have averaged very poor-godmakers. They knew but little history and did not live long enough to see how incompetent their deities turned out. Like children with empty-faced dolls, they hugged them long after the first flush of fitness. In all those dreary ignorant centuries, the modeling and picturing of a Power they had never more than glimpsed (and always misinterpreted) could have had but one outcome, viz., that each modeler (each would-be theologian) made his god in his own image. He then enlarged this imagined being, claimed him invisible to others, and complimented him as being the creator of the world.

Surely it is time for a more religious treatment of this central religious theme. Twentieth century people should be beyond being peeved at what Science is "taking away from them." There was little or nothing to take away. Science fills an empty place. It points out the counterfeit we have been doting on. All honest —thoughtful people will be grateful for this amazing discovery. Science has found both God and the Universe. The Ancients never more than guessed either. Science for the first time makes us understandingly conscious of Infinite Spiritual Presence.

—D. J. H. W.

Where Men Have Seen God

From Earliest to Latest Times

Early Progress Compelled Not Planned

The present age surveys space and time from the plateau of "Evolution." It is accustomed to look down from its giddy height with a feeling of self-pride at the contrast between its condition and that of the low stages when first it recognizes the creature man. It congratulates itself all too willingly over the great work that it has accomplished. But the more the work of ethnological and archaeological investigation proceeds, the more our scientific inquiries throw off the dark veil from those primitive times, the more are we coming to see the workings of Nature upon the development of life, the influence of man's environment in driving him out on and up. Especially must we regard the man's initiative factor as but little active in early times, or, better, as not yet having reached a state of activity in those early stages of human career. As in the pre-human life, so here, the surroundings molded the man as first and chiefly, for many ages. Now, the higher men mold the surroundings to a very considerable extent. From the first, the subjective power was an increasing quantity, tho practically beginning at zero. Not reasoning and philosophical reflections, but outward necessities drove man into social relationships and

bonds with his kin, as over against the rest of animate existence. And the external compulsion of this social relation compelled him to communicate, to learn to speak with his fellows in their common struggle for life. Necessity, especially in all the earlier period, became the mother of his inventions, and thus developed his intellect for him. He had neither the wish nor the capacity to think till Nature drove him to it. It put in him the unsuppressible impulse to live, and it made the conditions so difficult that he must go forward in order to live. Not his own voluntary conclusions and considerations at first, but the straits into which Nature put him, called forth the development of his meagre capacities. He was brought face to face with necessities on the solution of which his life was conditioned. And thus there was more and more awakened the consciousness of his condition. He was ever compelled to exercise what powers he had, while he ever reaped a reward in the form of an extension of life and an increase of capacity.

Nor may we make any exception in the case of his religious nature. If we understand evolution we must be consistent and say that when he had reached a sufficiently intelligent stage to have these attitudes, environment was again active in driving him into the consequences and activities which these imply. It is the entrance upon these, together with language, that marks the completion of the transition from the merely animal to human life. Mr. Darwin especially, and others also, have shown that man does not monopolize the moral realm. The family, and to some degree the social relation, exist among var-

ious animal species. But with man the strengthening of the social bond brought the means for its extension, viz., language.

Origin of Religion

Again, the further awakening of his powers of observation and thought revealed to him the world in which he had been living and stirred his simple reffection into exercise concerning its deeper and underlying realities. In other words, it set him over against his environment, in its parts or its wholeness, in what we now term the religious attitude.

Just what may have been the first occasions of this new mental condition, is perhaps beyond our powers of knowing.

It may have been the benignant activities of Nature which stirred his thought about it.

It may have been the raging fury of the elements threatening him with destruction and death which made him suspect that there were personal malevolent powers whom we must try to appease in any and all possible ways.

It may have been the phenomenon of death itself taking hold upon his being and moving him to seek the favor of the power which his imagination would naturally personify as its cause.

It may have been the animistic notion, maintained by Herbert Spencer, Julius Lippert and others, that he strove to propitiate and win over the double of the dead into his favor, or at least to maintain its neutrality in his further struggle for life.

Of it may have been the reverence for the leader of

the community in the personage of high and superior old age, awakened by the demands upon him in his growing social relationship, as held by Caspari.

Considering the feebleness of early man's reflective reasoning, it is more probable that the first inciting force was of a negating, destroying kind, since such motives act with so much more weight on low grades of mind. Be the first incentive or awakening what it may, there can be no doubt to him who has made some acquaintance with primitive minds, that the earlier instances of reflective life must have been very simple, and that there could have been in the stupid, beastly wonderings, fears and loves of these primitive human creatures very little approach to what we now call "the idea of God." Nor can we assume that they had any notion of a "soul" at their entrance upon the religious life, unless we hold the theory that it was thru the development of the soul-idea in notions about sleep, dreams and death, that the religious sentiment arose and became ancestor worship.

Primitive Religions

We are now able to see that an attempt to study the religious sense broadly meets an antagonism in our own feelings. To the stuff that fills the savage mind we are inclined to deny the name of religion at all. But we are not to investigate with our feelings. As the later man grew up from the earlier, so his religious thought had its parentage in the vague indefinite imaginings of those simple children of the far away ages. And hence there is a common element in what we are bound to dignify as their faith. It is certainly not conspicuous at first sight. The

religions of the lower savage races differ so much from ours that they appear to be quite the opposite in many ways. Their gods are evil, not good; they are weak, not strong—even to a great extent under man's power; they are not always even wise, much less omniscient; they delight in bloody sacrifices, often of human beings, rather than in mercy; they often approve of vice, not virtue; they are of Nature, not its creator; and they are mortal, not immortal. We think we do best when we most submit ourselves to the laws of Deity; they triumph only when they evade or control their gods. We often gratefully recount the blessings received; they believe that if the good does not come of itself some evil being has interfered.

In the childhood of the race and in the childhood of each individual there seems to be inherent the belief that all Nature is animate, and that all have therefore the power of sense perception in greater or less degree. The Borneo Dyaks believe that not only animals but plants have a mental nature. When plants decay they say, the soul has left them. When the missionary Phillips irreverently grumbled at the heat of a sultry day, a young Fuegian anxiously warned him "not to call the sun hot, because it would hide itself, and the wind would blow cold." (Ausland, 1861.) Lichtenstein tells a good story illustrating this general belief. An anchor was found stranded off the coast of South Africa. The chief of one of the Kaffir tribes, Amachosa, ordered that a piece be broken off from it. Not long afterwards, the man who did it died, and thereafter the Kaffirs paid homage to the injured anchor as having been the cause of the man's death. (Reisen in

S. Afr., 1811.) The simple people of New South Wales think it is disagreeable to the rocks to have whistling in their presence, and they tell the story of how some of their people were killed by the falling of rocks when they whistled near the foot of the precipice. It is also remarkable that the Tonga Islanders regard all whistling as disrespectful to the gods. In Kamtshatka, the Itelmes believed that the water wagtails were the authors of Spring, because with their coming came the warmer season; and they pay them a homage and worship due to their supposed function. Captain Cook gave the Tahitians some small nails. These they sowed in the hope of growing young ones. They belived that "not only all animals, but trees, fruits and even stones, have souls, which at death, or upon being consumed or broken, ascend to the Divinity with whom they first mix, and afterwards pass into the mansions allotted to each." (Mariner's Tonga Islands, II,137.) They sometimes broke or killed the implements which they buried with the dead, that their spirits, like those of the wives and slaves which were killed, might accompany the spirit of their master to the land of shadows. Burton tells of the Mohawk notion that one would meet with great misfortune if he spoke on Lake Saratoga. A strong-minded English woman who kept on talking while being ferried over, taunted the boatman about his superstition; but he replied, "the Great Spirit is merciful, and knows that the white woman cannot hold her tongue." (Abbeokuta, I,198; quoted by Lubbock.)

These references to awe in the presence of the objects of Nature are indeed remarkable characteristics of man in

primitive conditions. Various views are held by scholars as to their origin. Oscar Peschel, the German ethnologist, believed it to be "a craving after the invisible author or cause." "All religious emotion proceeds only from the desire for acquaintance with the Creator, and the worship of a deity is extinguished the instant that it ceases to satisfy the requirements of causality." (Races of Men, 247, 257.) Professor C. C. Everett regarded it as an unclear sense of the supernatural which is always and everywhere natural to man. Professor Max Mueller held that the ground of this, as of all religion, is in man's incentive toward and yearning after the Infinite—more or less clearly defined. (Hibbert Lectures, 1878.) Still others hold that it is a tendency traceable to dreams. Thru these the savage comes to believe in a world of supernatural existences and powers which he does not understand and which he believes to exert a great influence over his life.

It is not necessary for the purposes of this booklet to consider which of these is true. In any event, the tendency is serving the purpose of an education to the individual or tribe.

Fetishism

If one gives some attention to the variety of objects which have called out the veneration of man, he is likely to be impressed with their indiscriminate character. An object to be thus adored need have no more striking characteristic than once to have called forth particular attention in some now forgotten manner. The tendency is within man and it is brought out now by one and now by

another object and circumstance. To him who believes in ghosts, there is a ghost in every corner. Any simple and casual object may come to be regarded as a fetich. Stones, weapons, vessels, plants, feathers, shells—anything, may come to mean the omen of good or evil to the simple child of Nature. It may even come to be thought of as having control over much of their lives. If they observe any sort of coincidence between the object and a certain want or result, in childlike reason they attribute the result to the influence of the fetich. If the savage is successful in the chase when a certain object has been carried with him, he attributes his success to the charm of the thing, whatever it may be. If reverse fortune attends his doings, this is also the fault of the fetish. Under such circumstances, he has at times not hesitated to punish it for supposed obduracy in not granting his wishes when it had the power to do so. If the Ostiak meets with misfortune, he angrily thrusts his fetish on the ground and beats it, sometimes breaking it in pieces . Rastus, said to be the last of the pagan Lapps (somewhere about 1840), punished his divine bauta stone by withholding his customary offering of brandy. Soon after this two of his reindeer were killed by lightning. This he took to be the work of the angry fetish. He spitefully gave to the stone the dead bodies of the animals, exclaiming, "Take that thou hast slain," and at once professed Christianity. (Related by Peschel from Globus, Jan., 1873.)

Stone and Rock Worship

Large stones and rocks have been objects of worship in all parts of the world. Meteorites must always have

been greatly reverenced where their nature and source were not understood. Near Chicomoztoc (the seven caves) is a huge meteor which was worshipped by the ancient Mexicans as the son of the god and goddess Ometeuetli and Omecihuatl.

Everyone has heard of the celebrated "Black Stone" at Mecca in Arabia, which the Mohammedans worship by kissing. They say that it shone brightly at first, but soon turned black on account of the sins of mankind. We should see a truth in this! There is another sacred stone built into the Mosque of Omar at Jerusalem. It is said to be the one on which the Prophet was carried to Heaven, and that it fell back to earth.

In Oregon there is a rock to which the Umpkwa Indians make pilgrimages.

Ewald in his History of Israel holds the view that the constant warfare waged by the Prophets against the worship of the "high places" probably refers to the tall pointed stones which the people believed to be symbolical of the Most High or the Most Holy. In all the early Jewish worship, the use of stones in one way or another was a conspicuous element. Jacob is said to have poured oil upon the top of the stone at Bethel after he had used it for his pillow. (Genesis xxviii, 18.)

Wherever the Celts made permanent abode in Europe, we find their menhir, their trilithon, cromlechs, tumuli, and circles of stone. One of these menhir at Carnac in Brittany was 63 feet high and 14 feet in diameter. To this class of objects of devotion belongs also the celebrated "blarney stone" of Blarney Castle, Ireland.

Within the space and period of Christendom, this sort of reverence has been several times forbidden by authority of Church and State. A council at Tours in A. D. 567 threatened excommunication against stone worshippers. In England, Theodoric, archbishop of Canterbury in the seventh century, King Edgar in the tenth and King Canute in the eleventh, each issued similar interdicts.

This sort of worship is more sublime when it takes for objects of adoration the crests of the mountains. Olympus was the seat of the more noble epic divinities of Greece. Sinai was the mountain of the Jewish legislation. And the more rare such elevations are, the more highly are they reverenced. On the heights of Serbais is a stone circle within which the Bedouin Arabs do not enter without first putting off their sandals. Other instances of this type of extreme reverence Peschel says are found in "the Shaman stone of the Mongolian Burats, a rock on the peninsula of Olchon on lake Baikal, and the mountain of Tyrma or Tirmak, on which the Guanches, the aborigines of the Canary Islands, took their most solemn oaths and from which enthusiasts voluntarily cast themselves as sacrifices."

Tree Worship

Tree worship has probably been practised wherever man has lived. There is something extremely impressive in the stately forst. And this is greatly enhanced by the action of sun, wind and storm. There is little wonder then that the primitive mind found it an object of reverence. More especially would this be the case where trees are rare or where there has been connected with them some

circumstance of note. To the Ostiaks, a tree is sacred if an eagle has made it a place of nesting during several years. In middle Siberia, if a Samoyed finds a cedar in a forest of firs or a clump of seven larches together, his reverence is commanded. When Xerxes was marching to Sardis in Lydia, he found a sacred plane tree, and thereupon adorned it with gold and left a guardian over it. In the groves of Mundakhol, a Dravidian tribe of Southern India, not a single twig is allowed to be injured. Some of the tribes in Africa offer oblations to the huge Adansonia, or monkey bread trees. And this custom also exists in Burmah. In a similar manner the Mexicans worship a cypress, the western Colorado Indians an oak, the Red Indians of Lake Superior an ash, and the Patagonians the solitary Wallitshu tree. Besides these, there may be named the Classic instances of the Grove of Dodona, the Plane Tree of Aulis mentioned by Homer (the remains of which are said to have been seen by Pausanias), the Pepal and the Indian Fig-tree revered by the Brahmins and Buddhists, the sacred Aspen of the Kirghiz, and the great Ygdrasil or Ash of Norse mythology.

The meaning of tree worship depends on the character of the offering. The early Arabs thought that certain trees were the abodes of the gods or were the gods themselves, and therefore they hung their weapons upon them. In the Mandingo country in Africa, Mungo Park saw trees hung with rags and shreds by which the natives hoped to avoid diseases, thus giving them to the trees. This superstition also prevailed in Europe. If in any way an afflicted person could convey a piece of his prop-

erty to a tree or to another person, he could thus rid himself of his malady. Bosman found that in New Guinea the sacred groves and tree were more assiduously visited in times of pestilence. Tylor tells us that in Southern Europe young girls often try to sell to travellers bouquets which have come from the house of a sick person. I well remember being often told in childhood not to pick up flowers, fruit, pins, etc., which had been dropped by others, since it was often done to give away some disease. This was in Ontario, Canada. I am told that the same notion prevailed in Germany.

These instances show that trees, like other gods, were propitiated from their supposed benevolent and malevolent attitudes.

Serpent Worship

The adoration of the snake has been more frequent than that of any other animal. Doubtless the reason for this is found in the peculiar mysterious character of the creature. A certain wonder attaches to the serpent that is not found among the rest of the animal creation. In India it has given rise to a type of worship called "Naga religion." The fact that the word Naga is found in the names of so many of the cities shows that this religion has been widely practised, as for example, Nagapoor, Widshanagara, Baghanagara, etc. And there is still a feast of Nagapanshmi, at which the Brahmins publicly worship the cobras.

The serpent was a conspicuous actor in the drama of early human affairs according to the Assyrio-Jewish legend of the "Fall" of Adam. Later in Jewish history,

Moses is said to have lifted up a brazen serpent for the adoration of the people in the time of affliction. It was preserved and taken to Palestine. There it was held in sacred remembrance at the Temple in Jerusalem until the pious but more advanced Hezekiah removed it in 720 B. C. In Mansel's Gnostic Heresies, we read of the Ophites, a Christian sect who were serpent worshippers. It exists in a vigorous state in the Negro kingdom of Dahomey, and thru slavery has spread to Haiti in the West Indies.

Water Worship

Water in all its forms has come in for its share of the reverence of man. The Hindus regard running water as divine. Sanctuaries have been reared at the sources of the Ganges, Jumma and Nerbudda. There is supposed to come a holy influence to the person who bathes in these waters. We see a devotion which challenges the world in the fact that some Hindus in order to wash their neighborhood idols carry on foot the water of the Ganges from Benares to Ramesseram, a distance equal to that from Boston to New Orleans.

A novel notion of piety, and one from which many modern people might take inspiration, is to be found in the regard of the Ancient Persians for the purity of the water. In direct contrast to the Hindus, they tried by all means to prevent pollution. So extreme was the belief, that it was thought a work of piety to build bridges, and thereby prevent wading thru the streams. But this reverence for the aqueous element did not hinder the great and angry despot, Xerxes, from lashing the Hellespont when it defeated for a time his ambitious plans. In striking

contrast again, is this with the so-called humble adoration of Canute, the Danish king of England. To prove to his credulous subjects that he had no power over the sea and to show his real reverence for it, he seated himself and others to wait for the incoming tide, pretending the while to forbid its advance. In various Old and New Testament stories, we have instances of the belief in the power of water to work miraculous cures. In the modern crowds that throng the seashores and the mineral springs, we have the same faith held and practised in perhaps a more intelligent way.

In these and a hundred other instances one readily sees the power of the religious motive in creating activity, in bringing about thought, and in increasing intensity of life.

Worship of the Heavens and of Heavenly Objects

Gradually, and as the human mind grew broader and stronger in its powers, the demand for more permanent objects of worship came on. Tree worship must sooner or later be supplanted by a more profound and stable basis. The destruction of the tree by old age or by the ravages of parasites, storms, or lightning, would also be the destruction of the plant god which resided in it. This process being ever and ever repeated must force the worshippers sooner or later to the recognition of still higher powers behind these perishable ones. It is hard to say what would next be appealed to and reverenced; but some sort of advance there must be. Here is a different form of the demand for causality, and it must mark a happy day for the people who arrive at it. Such an inquiry for a Power which is behind the conspicuous phenomena of Na-

ture is an index of a higher intellectual maturity. We should naturally expect to find that there had been a considerable change in the circumstances of their lives. If the primitive hunter had begun to till the soil, even to a very slight extent, his attention would be inevitably drawn to the workings of the elements which influence vegetal growth—the sunshine, the rain, the atmosphere changes, etc. The field becomes vastly extended. For a considerable period yet, he must see in the separate phenomena powers that seem to him independent. But this lifting of man's eyes from the earth to the heavens was a bright day in man's education. Religion was ennobled and life was broadened. The sun, moon, stars and storms might prove tyrants, but not of such petty sort as had been the more earthly objects.

In every religion, the Heavens, the bright upper regions, become sooner or later the designated abode of deities or deity. The suggestion for it is clear. There the glorious dazzling sun daily lifts itself. There the glittering stars nightly travel the sky. There man's eyes gradually lifted and mysteriously love to dwell on the infinite depths of the blue dome under which he treads. Its color suggests to him warmth, serenity and peace. Hence in "his ecstacies of joy or paroxysms of fear or pain," man naturally lifts his hands and eyes above to the boundless source of all that he most highly esteems. (Blue as a paint expressive of friendly intent was in wide use among even the rudest hunting tribes, says Loskiel in his "Gesch. d. Mission d. Evang. Brueder," p. 63.)

Man finally grew to believe that from above came

the strong and the good, and from below came the inferior and the evil. Superior came to mean higher than I am, in a good sense. In the Algonquin language, "Ogheema," or chieftain, means "the Higher One." "Superbus," proud, in the Latin, is etymologically the same in meaning as "Wakanicidapi" in the Dakota language.

Moral Education Thru Religion

We have now arrived at the stage when religion begins to exercise a powerful influence on morality. It has been the background for conduct that was moral all along, but the peculiar feature is that conduct has been so little moral. As religion has been conceived in very narrow lines, so has morals. The interests of the fetich worshipper are not broader in the one than in the other. Peschel and some others hold that "religious emotions appear in human societies far earlier than the distinction between good and evil, and therefore have nothing to do with the subsequent laws of morality." But as history does not extend to the times when such a condition existed, this view is entirely without historical support. But that is not all. There are still deeper considerations against it. Religion is to a greater or less extent a matter of observation upon and sympathy with the world of objects about man. It is something learned, not born. On the other hand, morality is a matter of human relations. It is grounded in instincts, biologically inherited. Some of them have to be curbed, some encouraged. It is a something which forces itself upon him, a condition with which he is born. Some sort of morality existed, and must have been recognized, before the emergence from the brute state. This is a matter of

definite observation upon the life of creatures below man and now extant. Evolutionsists are quite generally satisfied that morality did not begin with man. Not so religion. The truly human state must have been entered upon ere anything which we designate by the term religion could have swelled in the breast of man. Religion is in no sense an instinct. It is cosmic interest, and later there is built up with this the anthropic or human sentiment. With the religious insight once aroused, it is easy to see what a moral factor it would eventually become.

Fritz Schultze in his "Fetichismus" observes: "The fact that the savage is so absolutely under the dominion of his Mokisso (fetish) and of his oath, constitutes the important educational element of fetishism. The savage imposes duties on himself." And Peschel in the same sentence in which he made the statement above cited, goes on to corroborate this view: "As soon as intercourse between the members of the same confederation is regulated by strictly observed customs, human institutions are believed to be derived from the commands of the Deity, and from this time religion becomes the most effectual means of education and improvement." (p. 253.) That which men revere they try to glorify. In doing this they refine themselves unconsciously, and later, consciously. If that which they would glorify has conspicuous glory in itself, it becomes so much the more a powerful moral element. The elements of conscious knowledge and power will always be attributed to it; and hence it is that the worship of the heavenly bodies and of the heavens as a whole becomes a more power moral inspiration than any

of the forms of worship which look at the things of earth alone. Even the Apache Indian under this view could point to the sun and ask the white man, "Do you not believe that this Deity sees our actions, and chastises us if they are wicked?" (Froebel, quoted by Tylor, Prim. Cult., I,286.) How much of the high morality and advanced civilization of the Incas of Peru was due to the great fact that they believed themselves to be the children of the orb of day? Did not their sincere and reverent worship of the sun have much to do with the genesis of their high moral standpoint? Lafitau cites the remark of a Huron squaw who on hearing a priest describe the perfections of God, exclaimed, "I had always pictured to myself our Areskui as of the nature which you ascribe to your God." By Areskui she meant the Sun and the Great Spirit.

But, as again and again heretofore, we have seen that there could be no rest when it was found that that which was worshipped was itself a creature or power dependent on a higher and more ultimate source, so Sun worship must recede before the advance of intellect. Hence wherever we find a nation which worships the sun, we may be sure that if we could know its history long enough, we should find an age in which a state of doubt would arise. Huayna Capac, a Peruvian Inca, about 1524 began to doubt whether the sun could be the creator of all things, because the progress of all went on without interruption during the night. It is therefore but a matter of time when even Sol himself is seen to be a child of the Sky. The changeless, self-moving Heavens gradually make their impression on man. Finally they seem to him to be the source and

supporter of all things. He is transferring his homage farther and farther and yet nearer and nearer to the true source. All the peoples who have risen to the stage called civilization have been, sooner or later, sky-worshippers of some sort. The "subdivo or sub-dio" of the Romans meant "under the open skies." And it was their word for the name of Deity as well. The old German idiom, "Der Himmel behuete dich" and the English, "Heaven help you" are indications of a time when the Supreme Deity and the Heavens were one in the minds of some of the people. The worship of the Heavens is still prevalent in China. (See Legge.) The Vedic Hymns of India abound with personifications and petitions to Varuna, the Enveloper. (Mueller.) Both Heaven and Earth are worshipped by the Hurons, and some Negroes on the West coast of Africa lift up their hands to the sky. (Tylor.)

Value of Nature Worship

It thus turns out that a religion may be valued by the amount of its stimulation toward culture, intellectual or moral. Viewed in this manner, the worship of the larger and more general forces of Nature is capable of doing much for man, especially in the development of his conscience. Nations having a severe morality are found to have severe or austere deities, and to hold more strictly to the idea that the world is governed by just laws. On the other hand, those nations who have lowered their gods to (or who have not elevated them above) the immoral level of their own passions, have themselves sunk lower and lower, and finally lost that social virtue which is neces-

sary to national preservation. Hence it is that we often find high grades of morality among races very inferior in their general political civilization. (Witness some of the cases quoted.) Where men firmly believe, as do the Polynesian Tongans and Friendly Islanders, that their gods approve the life of virtue and hate the life of vice, that the guardian spirit of a man will watch over him while he is honorable and forsake him when he is wicked, there is exerted an influence for good which is not easy to rightly estimate.

Influence of the Gods on Conduct

The largest examination of the facts will show, that of all the factors entering into the development of human institutions, religion is the most potent. Its influence has been mighty, both for the good and the evil. Some nations it has elevated, some it has destroyed. It never fails to become a most powerful lever for human education when the deity or deities are amplified with high moral conceptions. The gods who have ignored righteousness never lifted their subjects into its plain. Lower the divine realm to the level of human affairs, human desires, human passions, and instead of becoming an aid to virtues and an inspiration toward ideal life, it furnishes the strongest sanction to vice and a support and encouragement to unrestrained indulgence. (It must be remembered that none of the gods of history exer existed outside the imagination of their worshippers.) These imaginary, invisible, yet ever-present authors of existence, these personified moral ideals, being the acknowledged legislators and judges or sources of right and wrong, will be obeyed whenever and

wherever their idealized laws and decisions are clearly visualized and understood. What the gods desire, men desire; what the gods hate, men hate; because men made the gods expressly to desire and hate. Hence (in the past) good religion has been the leading influence and power by which humanity has been uplifted. In this way its influence is far wider than at first appears. It becomes the stimulant which creates for man his science, his art and ethics.

Forms and Creeds

It was previously hinted that religion can flourish without manifest moral relations. Not that in such cases it has always been immoral, but merely unmoral. Ages upon ages must have elapsed before the whole better ideal element of life was thought of as embodied in the very nature of the deity, and ages more must have passed before the character of the imagined deity was striven to be embodied in the individual life. With how small a number, even in the most enlightened lands at this late period, is there a feeling of realization that religion may be or should be much more than form, a profession, a mere believing of something! Advances begin in the minds of occasional individuals. A religion that is helpful morally stimulates to greater advances and higher life. It becomes an aid to the spread and enforcement of a higher moral status. In conditions of religious decay, there are always to be found men who are better than their creeds. They are morally superior to their gods. But such individuals are in advance. These are not better than their actual religion. Religion and creed are not synonymous. A con-

spicuous instance is that furnished in the Christian creeds and the real Christian spirit, or between average Christian conduct and the real Christian religion or ideal apart from its creeds. The latter recognizes the brotherhood of humanity, and thus it stands as an ideal far above the daily conduct of those who but dimly profess to adore the God from whom it is supposed to have been promulgated. Instead of adopting directly and practising the essential doctrine, there is substituted a system of belief, and the poor Chinaman, Indian or Turk is brought in guilty oftentimes for what is in reality our own sin. Because of our lack of genuineness in living out our religion at its best, he gets no credit for what honesty or moral purpose he really possesses. In comparison with our ideal, he is set down as degraded, low, savage, fanatical, or full of malicious nature.

In our own or other lands, all this is only evidence of the still undeveloped state of those among whom it prevails. It is complicated by systems of theology, creeds and ceremonies. But underneath and in the nature of things there is a strong tendency toward making the province of ethics and religion coincide as soon as and ever after inward moral purity and observance of social obligations are insisted on as divine laws. Sir John Lubbock, who has given much attention to this great question, says: "The sacred character, which forms an integral part of our conception of duty, could not arise until religion became moral. Nor would this take place until the deities were conceived to be beneficent beings. As soon, however, as this was the case, they would naturally be supposed to regard with ap-

probation all that tended to benefit their worshippers, and to condemn all actions of the opposite character." (Orig. of Civil., 4th ed., 409.)

When a community comes to believe that not form, but conduct; not ceremony, but righteousness; are proofs of reverence, its individuals, consciously or unconsciously, begin to make these into their lives. That which is thought to be divine, all men desire, and many hope and strive to exemplify. Do they believe they reach it by oblations and sacrifices, then will they offer these. Do they think that the divine will is done by their believing in a sacrifice that their generous god has provided himself, then will they offer up credulity instead of righteous conduct. Do they believe in divinely appointed laws in the nature of life and society, the obedience to which is absolutely indispensible for the obtainment of that divine sanction which is exhibited by a constant advance and growth in all that makes life higher, then will they substitute for all those former extraneous things a loyal righteous life. And in all directions but this last, the efforts not only fall short, but they are open to special dangers from exclusive attention to some one feature, or from man's love of approbation. He who believes in sacrifices is tempted to vanity in trying to make the greatest sacrifice. He who believes in exalted states and rapturous feelings will hesitate at no extravagance in asceticism or artificial excitement to attain the ecstacy he longs for.

Origin of Priesthood and Church

Among all peoples during historic times, the Church (or what was its equivalent) has been one of the two or

three most important topics of human interest. The people of Christendom mostly think of the Church as a definite institution having a definite origin about eighteen centuries ago. And so of all lands. Each people thinks of its own religious institutions as special, original, typical. But in reality each is only an illustration. The Church is not Palestinian or European. It is a human institution, developed out of the social relations. It occupies a peculiar and unique position.

Society began with the family. In this, the father being the natural protector, became the head or leader in all affairs during many ages. He was not only political head, but also leader in whatever simple religious ceremonies the family required. As the number of families grew and formed themselves into clan relations for mutual protection against outside enemies, there developed the necessity of leadership. The tribe must have its chief. The oldest, wisest and strongest came to the front.

But the tribe, as well as the family, had its religious interests, and the public recognition and care of these devolved upon the chief. In the early stages, he was both chief and priest at once. And while the cluster of families was small, the patriarch found it possible to be domestic, political, and religious chief. Gradually as the tribal interests became more complex, the multiplicity of duties became too numerous for the individual patriarchal oversight. Some of the duties must be done by proxy. He naturally delegates to someone else those duties of the least immediate interest. Hence he keeps the political control and appoints assistants to perform the tribal cere-

monies. Instances of this condition of social development are to be found in New Zealand, Madagascar, Sandwich Islands, many Indian Tribes, Mexican Mayas, Peruvian Incas, Siamese, Japanese, Chinese, Ancient Egyptians, Assyrians, Davidic Israelites, Ancient Athens (under Archons, where the king was rex sacrorum), Romans under kings, Scandinavians, Empire of the Middle Ages under Charlemagne, Italy, Spain, Great Britain and others.

In many of these there is or was a chief priest. Each domestic head remains priest in his own family. A priest is the social officer for religious things. The chief priest is the grand social officer for religious affairs. He corresponds to the chief in political relations. It is a question of investiture of authority according to recognized or admitted right. Sons and women, as such, have no right to perform these functions. (See the injunctions in the New Testament, and even today in family and pulpit.)

The complexities of his duties and the dignity of his station at length compelled the chief to appoint generals, captains, judges, advisors and priests. Livy says, Numa "instituted flamens to replace the kings when the latter were absent," i. e., in wars, etc. The traveller MacDonald writes that among the Blantyre Negroes, "if the chief is from home, his wife will act [as priest]), and if both are absent, his younger brother." We observe the survival of this in England in the present usage, where the younger brothers of the lords so generally "take orders," i. e., become clergymen. In the old Mexican kingdom of Acolhuacan and that of Tlacupan, the high priest was sec-

ond son of the king. In Ancient Peru, he was an uncle or brother of the king, or a legitimate member of the royal family.

Seniority of age and superiority of wisdom or power are the next differentiating qualifications for priestly duties. Witness again the survival of this in the expressions "Father," "Elder," "Reverend," "Right Reverend," "Very Reverend," and "Pope," (i. e., Great or Holy Father).

A curious digression from this more natural transmission of religious functions is witnessed in the occasional setting apart of a whole tribe, as of the Levites among the Ancient Hebrews, or of two tribes, among the Santals of India. But these tribes probably had their function by right of descent. Levi was the second son of Jacob, the patriarchal chief.

From the original incentive to religious functions there has been a long and complicated development of religious conceptions—from fetishism thru polydemonism, polytheism, to monotheism and monism. And along with this have gone corresponding changes in the social organization and government. A coercive type in the one has been accompanied by the same in the other. Where there is no close social organization, there is no close religious one. The Empire of the Middle Ages was closely followed by the invincible Papal Hierarchy. And tho they quarreled with each other, they united in showing no quarter to other tendencies in politics or religion. When the throne of Papal power began to weaken under the Renaissance movement, the imperial thrones began to

change situations and occupants and break up their domains. Among peoples like the Comanche Indians or the Nagas, there are no priests, and correspondingly there are no consolidated or regulated organizations. It is not assumed that one is the cause of the other, for they are both influenced by other causes. The Tahiti people, tho in some respects a primitive race, are socially much differentiated. They have their king, nobility, land owners and common people. For each of these classes there are special priests, and those for the national temples are distinct.

It must also be observed that where the theology is highly developed, the religious organization is more distinct. In China, where the religious thought is simple, the emperor was also ruler in the spiritual realm. In Christendom, where theology is developed into a system of philosophy, the Church is far more separated from the State.

Mutual Influence of Church and State

Thus we see that Church and State grew from one root, and that they were at first one. After the differentiation had once begun, the political and religious leaders were mutually subject to each other. When the priest had become the representative of the Deity, he therefore gave or withheld his sanction to the civil authority. Thus the chief came to be subject to the religious rule, because he with his subjects was a subject of the gods—when the gods had grown great enough. Strabo and Diodorus record the fact that the priests at Meroe in Ancient Egypt occasionally ordered the king to put an end to himself, and that they were obeyed without opposition. So to a

greater or less extent, the kings and rulers in all countries and times have been subject to the priesthood in their conduct and mode of living. The priest is the man of influence with the supernatural powers and the man of knowledge about supernatural things. He can forgive sins or lay down the conditions therefor. He can furnish passports to the next world, or he can excommunicate. As such, he holds an inexplicable and mysterious balance of power. To follow his course is believed to bring blessing; to disobey it brings an evil train.

In later times when the differentiation became still more complete and the separation of Church and State was supposed to be an accomplished fact, there still remained a most potent power and influence in favor of the former. In the latest as well as in the earliest times, the civil authorities are installed with religious rights and sanctions. The oaths and prayers administered by priest-sanctioned judges and priest-ordained priests are at the back of the ruler, whether he be the President of the United States, the King of England, the Emperor of Germany or Saul the first King of Israel.

Of course, in all this age-long influence of the priest and his religious faith on matters of State and also moral policy, he has been a power incalculable in educating and directing this side of man's development. It is not necessary here to discuss the special value, character and quality of that training furnished by the religious sentiment to the social development. It is only to be borne in mind that religion is first a cosmical theory, then an added moral theory. Next, the two are objectified and personalized into

a divine being or beings. Then this imagined being is made the cause of the world and the source and standard of moral conduct.

Medical, Legal and Pedagogical Differentiations

Out of the division of patriarchal function begun with separating the priesthood, has grown a vast system of other social labors. As mankind developed desires and an understanding of the world without, it became necessary to have those desires and conditions met by a further apportionment of services. Like the division of function which took place between chief and priest, so the next steps come about on the lines of the most widely separated needs. In the early stages of social development the priest was naturally the man of widest culture. Aside from the political field, he was the sole professional man. He was therefore a source for all intelligence. He gave opinions on the physical ailments as well as the spiritual. He did all the teaching that was done outside of the family. He was the authority behind the throne, or the ultimate appeal in matters of right and justice.

But just as the duties of the chief became so numerous that they had to be divided and done partly by proxy, so here also as the social structure increases in size and complexity, the multifarious duties of the priest are too difficult. Those of them who show the most knowledge and skill in a given direction naturally give their time and attention to that phase. These proclivities may be seen in the astronomer-priests among the Ancient Chaldeans, the medicine-men among the Indians, the monk-teachers among the priesthood of the Middle Ages.

Again, it must be noticed that the necessity of maintaining their standing in the community, when once under way, compelled a certain amount of preparation for their labors. This was still further emphasized by the growth of competition which begins to be an element of stimulation in all societies which have reached a stage where two or more are following in lines of similar or like occupations. Hence arose schools, simple at first, and only for the teaching of the most rudimentary elements of their trade. But here again, as knowledge increased it must lead to differentiation. And the school itself would prove the source of new professions. Thus it was that the monkish schools of the Middle Ages, started merely for the purpose of inculcating a deeper piety and for instructing the coming priests, came to be the universities of the Renaissance time. Out of the study of the "sacred" came the study of "natural" and "social" law and "mental" law, and finally the whole realm of modern knowledge.

The same order and processes of development may be seen in some of its lower stages in India and China today. The "sacred books," of the peoples coming down from very early times, were the starting points for whatever higher professions they have attained. And what we see in the ancient and modern history of these Oriental nations, we see also in the career of the Egyptians, Greeks and Romans whose national lives did not reach into modern times. Everywhere it is the religious stem from which proceeded the later lines of further differentiation. Nor has the differentiation ceased. The religious incentive is still giving rise to new tendencies which will undoubtedly in the

course of time develop into new channels of human activity in the form of separate professions. And this will mean, as it has meant in the past, new fields and instruments of human education and development. We think of the various types of philanthropy begun and stimulated by the advanced churches of these days, of the new educational enterprises, of the mission undertakings, and of the change coming over the teaching of the Church as a whole, and over the most advanced portion of it in particular, as to its function. This last is worthy of special mention. Those who have grasped more or less of the real nature of religion see this fundamental educational feature or office of it and are laboring toward having it recognize itself as the pioneer in inspiring and helping man to enter upon advanced ground and to cultivate new fields of truth, rather than to hinder these activities.

Character and Its Basis

But religion is not merely the ultimate source of the higher social differentiations, it has likewise become the ground of individual character. Whether it has been clearly perceived or not, this has been the real fact, for it was faith—conscious or not—in the reliability of the Power posited and promised at the bottom of things which provided the basis for an improving conduct.

Ever since religion had its moral side, it has been the perception of Law supposed to be imposed from without; and character has been obedience thereto. Without some sort of belief or trust in the basic condition of life, there can be no conscious moral conduct; and the profounder or more conscious that confidence trust; the more consistent

the conduct. But this is merely the assertion of the now-inseparable relation between religion and character. The men of highest character have been the men who believed —not backward, but forward. Such were the genuine prophets and saints, and such are the genuine men of Science. Such were all the men whom later times revere. Moreover, it is this attitude of mind that leads to more and higher truth. And when the old faith—no matter what it is—is weakened by new discovery, there follows a deterioration of character, unless there is another faith to take its place. If the previously accepted basis of conduct is questioned by large numbers (as in Roman times), there follows what Professor Goldwin Smith says we are again in danger of, viz., **"a moral interregnum."** This is the gravest condition into which any people can ever fall.

Thus we perceive that religion is more and more at the foundation of all conduct that has the element of high conscious moral character in it.*

(*Distinction is here made between "moral character" and "instinctive morality," which latter belongs to many creatures below man, besides being the greater element in men of low intelligence.)

Not only this, but in thus affording a ground for conscious right action, it at the same time provides the way for the further advance of religious insight and truth. Religion that is not forward-looking is ceasing to be religion. And unless this process goes on steadily, not only is truth not discovered, but character declines. And when once a process of decline has begun the decay of character becomes itself a further cause of decay. The action is

both forward and backward. The true acted, is the good; and the good results in greater perception of the true. The true is the actual. The good is the ideal. The beautiful is the union of the actual and the ideal. "The true is what is; the good is what ought to be; the beautiful is what is as it ought to be."*

Life thus lived is at one with itself. It is religious. Religion now is the recognition of the possibility of life improving by action. It is the joy of responding to upward effort. Moral character is the conscious endeavor which strives to keep up to that recognition. The result is a forward-leaning serenity of mind. This (not doctrine or dogma) is religion. In its highest form, it takes the world as a natural world, and stimulates man to conduct his life on the foundation of natural conditions. It whispers,

"Throb thine with Nature's throbbing breast,
And all is clear from east to west."

The Changing Content of Religion

Perhaps the greatest difficulty in the understanding and treatment of this question is, that the devotional content of religion has changed so greatly and has been so differently conceived—indeed, is even yet, that we are apt to mistake that formulated statement for the substance.

The definition given in the last section provides for or is drawn from the facts, with this fact conspicuously in view. If we are in sight of the real substance of religion, it has from the start contained an act of reason or general-

*See a more extensive discussion of the point in this section in my book, "A Receivership for Civilization."

ization, be it ever so low. As much or more than aught else in man's nature, it marks the differentiation from the brute into the human. Whatever else it is or has been, religion is always a cosmical theory and the basis of moral action. (See also Romanes, Mental Evolution in Man.)

For ages, this process of development was, from our present way of seeing things, untellably slow. But it began—this is the important feature—and it grew. And in it we have the potency of the future religion and science. They start at the same root. One became the feeling of interest in, and the other the method of treating the problems at, the foundation of life. It has been an infinite process of seeing, experiencing and inferring.

Man began to think and reason over that which he conceived to be harmful and injurious to him. He watched such forces jealously. He devoted to them his simple study. He thought that because they moved and produced effects, they therefore had life. Hence they were subject to motives. If so, then he could buy off their harmful, evil intent. And he propitiated them.

He by and by recognized that he had paid his offerings to his own imagination. The evil did not come from where he thought it did. He has discerned more deeply. He has seen broader meanings to many phenomena. He has unified various manifestations as proceeding from a single Power. His fetishism advanced to polytheism.

This simple polydemonism and animistic tendency has come down from remotest ages. By the process of elimination and unification here described, it has expanded and improved. The mind (at first conscious of the facts and

forces about it, but only in the most disjointed manner) grows by putting these together in ever more proper relations. This is what growth of mind is, viz., comprehension and insight accomplished by cerebrational association processes. The mountains, woods, streams, winds, rains, etc., which he took for separate and unrelated powers, he by and by perceives are all parts of one world. So too, the sky, the sun, the stars, which he thought the abodes of other gods than those of earth, he has eventually found to be but parts of one system, and all floating together in the Great All of space. Thus by greater and greater breadth of observation and by keener interest and insight has he kept on solving the perplexities which have confronted him. The outward objects of his religious attention have been the developers of his inward religious conceptions and feelings. And the religious sense once engendered, has in turn been his most powerful stimulation toward learning the true nature of the outward objective world. It has been his most inspiring teacher.

Anthropomorphism

There are no evils brought on may by man which do not have some possible good. Among the most baleful things under which he has suffered are the creeds which he has formulated and made himself the slave of. Yet even they have had their place in the process of man-training. The very grossest anthropomorphisms have been a school at which man has learned better things. They were attempted explanations of the world and of human relations thereto. Their crudeness was the result of the slackness of those who formulated them and of the others who lived by them.

The trouble they caused and the difficulties into which they led were the penalty for carelessness and indifference. Out of the need which the bad begets there grows a better creed. This is inherent and necessary. If for example, the gods are not ideals and are not maintained as such, human conduct suffers. The Greeks who allowed to their gods the evil motives and conduct indulged in by their own passions were taught a better lesson by the bad effects of their low ideals. And the Europeans and Americans of later centuries, where they have believed in a God that makes law, the penalties for whose violations can be evaded by bribe substitutes and ceremonies, have a conduct and a civilization which match the belief. In politics and commerce they practice the most conspicuous moral characteristics of their God by bribing and undermining each other.

Social Reflexes on Primitive Theology

It is true of all these creeds that they were morally relatively better in their early stages, and were a check on still worse doings. It requires cruel vengeful gods to move cruel peoples. The treacherous, jealous, unprincipled Hindu or Persian could have found the reason for his doctrine of demons and hells in his own disposition. So again, the concept of divine vengeance and of the tortures of the damned were probably the best antidote to the unsympathetic and hard feelings of the Christian world of earlier and later times. Dante and Milton were but the artists who painted the transfigured feelings of their contemporaries. George Eliot has said something to the effect that the gods always and everywhere are but the shadow

reflections of human ideas cast in gigantic perspective on the clouds of heaven,—or I may add, seen in lurid gleams in the pits of darkness. This contains a large truth which is clearer and truer when the word "but" is removed.

After ages of social discipline have humanized "the heart," the intellectual ideal regarding the divine sources also improves. The gods take on a better character. And the reason is clear. The study of the forces of the cosmos goes on **pari passu** with that of the ethnos. Study in either improves the other. Theology is therefore seen to be transfigured sociology.

Corresponding with the disintegrated society of the early Aryans in India, we find the most unregulated mythology as the content of their religious mind. The tempest, wind, thunder, fire, dawn, twilight, sun, and all the phenomena and powers of Nature claim their attention, but without order or subordination. In henotheistic manner their feelings go out toward each.

The Greeks and Romans, more socially developed, brought a better order into their theological conceptions. Their world of spirits is full of the struggles and relationships which are on the earth. As in their early history we find the people entering upon a more democratic stage of social life, so too among the gods, Zeus, who had been supreme and who was later nominally so, had lost his authority as absolute ruler, and deigned (or was compelled) to consult with the other deities.

Some of the Hebrews had accomplished the unification at an early period, and their later monotheism in the person of the burly jealous Jehovah was the transfigured

picture of their more ethical, but still monarchical government. In the former they studied the latter. And as they did so, both improved. Not having the facts from which to interpret properly, the so-called evils of life, they (by help obtained from the Persians during their Captivity) developed a more perfect God by accounting for the evil in another way. Before that, Yahweh had created good and evil at his will. In Persia they borrowed or stole the Devil, and thereafter made him responsible for all features which their idea of God forbade ascribing to Jehovah. Jehovah improved in character. Later on the tender-hearted Jesus conceived of him as a Heaven Father who would take pity on a wretched humanity. Thus was transferred to the West that system of dualism which has had such extensive adherence among Gnostics, Kabbalists, Neo-Platonists, Manichaeans, Roman Catholics, and Protestant Christians. As a profound problem of study, and thereby as a possible means of development, it has had scarcely a rival in all man's career. To it at bottom must be attributed the growth of the whole strictly Christian literature of these nineteen centuries. They have been devoted to the one grand end of trying to solve the problem of evil. Nor will it ever be possible to estimate its influence, both for good and evil, on the Western civilization.

The problem is now changing. Recent developments in Science may be said to have completely inverted it. Not the "origin of evil" now perplexes men, but the origin of the good. And the difficulty seems already well passed. (See chapter on "The Problem of Evil" in "A Receiver-

ship for Civilization.")

At the time of the Roman conquest of the world, the religion of the Hebrews was the one which naturally came forward as the nearest representative of the social conditions. It supplemented all others because is accomplished the unification of the gods and because its central ideas were moral ones. Rome conquered the world and made it a socio-political unity. A world politically unified, under one control, by military force, must soon have a religion to correspond and to make the unity more real. Because all nations had been brought into one, all civil and political problems had become ethical. Out of this condition was drawn the larger family inference by him "who spake as never man spake," that God was one—the Father of all—and that all men were brothers. The larger social interest grew out of Roman unification. To secure the complete adoption of this foundation belief "in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man" has been the one object and effort of the Christian minds of all the Occidental nations in all these "Christian ages." And this is true, whether they have been orthodox or heterodox. For one end have they thought, written, preached and striven. They have had different conceptions of God and different notions as to how men were to be made to realize and live up to their notion of a brotherhood.

GOD TODAY

The New Monism

And now, in a final chapter, it remains to see a little more clearly how the little world of primitive man, which was at first conceived as a congeries of objects each with

its presiding anthropomorphic spirit, has thru man's religious interest grown to be a Universe. In it he has at last discovered the Only Real Deity, the Universal Spirit, the one Eternal Energy, from which all things and worlds and lives have proceded. Moreover, this creature, man himself finds that he has developed from a wild and prowling animal, herding intermittently in loosely joined tribes, fearing every phenomenon of terrestrial or celestial origin, into vast social aggregates—sometimes reaching a hundred million—organized and sub-organized into a thousand-and-one co-operative efforts. His achievements have become so numerous and so profound as to make his present self a wonder far surpassing even his fiction gods in his racial childhood.

The Fading Away of Dualism

The standard traditions which come down to us from the Assyrians, Jews, Greeks, and Romans professed to be Dualism, but were nearer Materialistic Monism. Their World, their God, their Heaven, their Hell, etc., were very sensuously conceived, and scarcely different from this world. This began to be set aside when the discovery of the New World and the Solar System took place. A new Geography, a new Astronomy and finally a new Ontology have been coming into view. We call the process the growth of Modern Science. Modern Science implies that there was an Ancient Science. Science, in this sense, is only the body of knowledge of any time or people. The difference between Ancient Science and Modern is one of thoroness and honesty. By these virtues the minds of some men have wrought wonders since the Fifteenth Century.

More recently they have discovered the evolutionary process. They have been engaged, as it were, in "Historical Research," for Evoliution, Biology, Geology, Astronomy, Chemistry are just "natural" history, the search for present and remote causes and influences.

Incidentally, our New Science has discovered the Universe—and other universes. The ancients never knew there was a universe. This movement has multiplied knowledge a thousand fold. It has straightened out, systematized and made intelligent a previously inconceivable realm. Much remains to be done. The meaning is not wholly clear. It is not all fully tellable. Expectancy, however, is large in this twentieth century.

Finding the Real God At Last

Physics and Chemistry, Biology and Psychology are today the text-books of Theology. For over 2,000 years tradition and speculation saw the World as Matter and Force. Sensation was the means. Reason wrought over what the senses brought. In man (a part of the Universe) the component materials have been called body and mind,—body, the matter; mind, the force. The Ancients called these Matter and Spirit. Tradition handed it on to and thru ignorant ages. The nature of either of these was given up as inscrutible. Modern Philosophy quite accepted this dictum, even down to Herbert Spencer, who thought that Force was unknowable. The recent work in Physics and Chemistry have gone a long way beyond the knowledge of the middle of the Nineteenth Century.

And recent Psychology has analyzed the process of sensation. Between the two, the way is open to Ontology

as an understandable science. Sensation is now believed to be the reception of phenomena in consciousness. This is not yet the perception of essence. It is merely the reading of impressions produced by the outward world in the inward consciousness. Analysis shows this to be motion, more or less rapid. Motion is the evidence of force produced by energy. Ingenuity or reason, thru invention, has called to the aid of sensation numerous mechanical appliances. Among these are the microscope, telescope, thermometer, barometer, micrometer, scales, measures, mathematical computation, etc. These magnify, minify, and intensify. Thus we can the better compare and analyze sensations. These and other instruments tremenduously magnify man's sensitive ability. (See Table of The External Senses.)

Meanwhile Physics (Dynamology) has been at work analyzing the phenomena. Impressions from objects do not reveal the objects, but only the effect of the motions on the consciousness. For example, the circle made by whirling a burning stick gives no idea of the flame or the stick, the man or the purpose. For example, again, a tone from a violin gives no idea of the violin, the string or the bow, nor of the nature of these, the man, or the piece of music. And so of all phenomena. They are not the things, but only the impressions made by the motions. We incorrectly designate these as things.

By some inner process of association, impressions are compared in consciousness—those from one sense with those from another. Inferences are made and after these, reasoning processes take place, i. e., better guesses are

reached. We see in, out, backwards and forwards. We arrive at theories. And again, we correct these theories by more seeing, in and out.

One of these inferences about Matter arose from the speculating and experimenting of John Dalton about the year 1800. It was called the "Atomic Theory." We all know what it is. We have heard it for one hundred years. It grew in favor as an explanation of the material side of the Dualistic Philosophy, till finally its advocates assumed it as a complete explanation, the ultimate philosophy, a Monistic Materialism. There were difficulties, but these were made light of. A considerable following and great excitement arose because of the contradictions between this philosophy and many cherished traditions.

To review a little—Sir Isaac Newton in 1708 had said: "Perhaps the whole frame of Nature may be nothing but various contextures of some certain etherial spirits or vapors, condensed, as it were, by precipitation and after condensation wrought into various forms, at first by the immediate hand of the Creator, and ever after by the power of Nature."

This old-fashioned materialistic conception made a good start. It was crude in placing the "Creator" outside of Nature, and in assuming some power in Nature miraculously placed there. But it was an anticipation of the most important result in our most modern physical investigation. Lord Kelvin, not so long ago, announced the new theory that the atoms are vortices in this Ether. Others have since actually explained the atoms as consisting of the more recondite electronic units.

Thus we have gone beyond atoms. We have analyzed them. They are motions of something finer. They are not things. They are phenomena of something. They are centers of force in this great underlying Basic Essence. They are conditions, not entities. They are phenomena, not reality. Just as in the larger world, so in them motion prevails. Motion is the universal condition, and the phenomena of all material existence. Sensation is the process of reading motion, of interpreting force. The senses are simply so many means of reading the various kinds of force directions—or motions. Motion in its essence is opposition, resistance to force arising from other motion. Spencer said: "The fundamental fact in nature is resistance; and the fundamental fact in consciousness is response to resistance."

Pushing these principles to their legitimate outcome, matter ceases to be the hard, inert, dead substance formerly supposed. It ceases to be any "thing." It is simply the forms in which the real thing manifests itself to us. This real thing, this universal basic condition is known to Science under the name Ether. In Dr. Stockwell's language, the Ether "is an immaterial, super-physical substance, filling all space, carrying in its infinite throbbing bosom the specks of aggregated dynamic force called worlds. It embodies the ultimate spiritual principle, and represents the unity of those forces and energies from which spring, as their source, all phenomena, physical, mental and spiritual, as they are known to man."

"Dead matter" is thus a dead theory. "Matter" was a product of the imagination, cogitated by men who were

tired of traditions. They did not analyze far enough. They took the senses literally. They did not make allowances. It was primitive interpretation, even tho it was called "Philosophy." The Universe is not worked upon by something outside. The Universe is that something. There is no outside. It is the life and power which we have been wrongly interpreting. Energy is life. The Cosmos lives. Even the rocks live. All things act. All things move, work and get tired. Prof. Dolbear has tired out a tuning-fork. Shafts, springs, etc., break down from hard work—too much action. Life has many degrees, modes, stages. Some of them stand very little action.

The elements are considered as so many types of fundamental motion of the Infinite Substratum. Backward in time, if we go far enough, they blend or dissolve into a unity deeper than "Matter." Even the last exponents of the newer materialims advocate the Ether. Prof. Haeckel said, "We are as sure of the Ether as we are sure of the existence of Matter." (!) This was equivalent to saying, we are as sure of the man as we are of the shadow. He also called the Ether the Eternal Substance. But he failed to see the humor in his statements. He was a Biologist who went beyond his beat. Matter does not exist as thing. It is a sensory condition of some essence that is vastly deeper. This later news from Physics tells us that "Matter" is a fiction of imagination resulting from misconception of sense impressions.

Ontology, then, turns out to be a science close to life. The Onta has been resurrected to the Psyche. The Universe is Basic Condition. It does not have our limited

attributes. It doubtless includes vastly more than we conceive. We are of the Universe. We have grown conscious. It is not everywhere conscious. We get our heredity from the Universe. We may be improving on or adding something to our parentage. We are more than former-time Nature. We are expanding. We are its variations. We are getting to know more than former life did. This means that things are knowable. Things are but forces in other terms (mistakenly conceived as static). The "Unknowable" has gone off with "Dead Matter." The capitals are dropped. A year before his death, Prof. Huxley said: "I no longer wish to speak of anything as unknowable; I confess I once made that mistake, even to the waste of a capital U."

"Substance" then, in scientific terms, is Ether. Ether is the basic substance—the only "substance." Ether is not Matter. In Prof. Dolbear's words, "It is daily becoming more certain that even in the physical universe we have to do with a factor—the Ether—the properties of which we vainly strive to interpret in terms of matter, the undiscovered properties of which ought to warn everyone against the danger of strongly asserting what is possible and what is impossible in the nature of things." He says again, "Physicists today concur in the belief that what was called at first luminiferous ether, on account of its function in transmitting light, is the same medium that is concerned in the other phenomena of magnetism, electricity, gravitation, and so forth. If the Ether can be said to have

density, it is less than $\frac{936}{1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000}$ that of water. And its rigidity is $\frac{1}{1,000,000,000}$ that of steel.

The Ether then is the nearest approach to the conception of the ultimate reality, which we know under other terms as the Infinite and Eternal Enargy—the Eternal God, the "Living God." What is this but a scientific way of saying "GOD"? What is it but "SPIRIT"? The Scientist says: "Matter is a mode of motion of Energy." Rev. Dr. Calthrop says, "Matter is a mode of motion of Spirit." And what is the difference? Calthrop further says, "All things, thoughts, beings, worlds are modes of motion of Spirit. Spirit substance underlies them all.

Hence Scientist and enlightened Religionist mean the same thing. They refer to the same thing. They give this Eternal Thing the same place in the scheme of existence. The trend of Scientific thought is unmistakably immaterial.

Nicholas Tesla somewhere writes, "Nature has stored up in the universe an infinite amount of energy. The eternal recipient and transmitter of this energy is the Ether." Observe in these lines the scientific doctrine expressed with earnest feeling, but with a very poor conception of its ontological and religious character. Like the rest of the world, he is saturated with the old attitude of some-power-thing which is assumed to be outside of everything. Who is this Nature that "has stored up," etc.? When did this Nature do this storing? Where is Nature? now that the storing has been done? Where does this Nature keep itself, since it appointed the Ether as its

Demi-urgos to do the work of the universe or to be "the eternal recipient and transmitter of this energy"?

Dr. Stockwell quotes Prof. Hemstreet as paraphrasing these views of Tesla thus: "Now call this energy God's mind and the ether God's body, then we have the secret of eternal life and the process of cosmic evolution. . . . God in the ether is no more strange than a soul in the body. . . . Gravitation, attraction and all energy and mind are qualities of the ether. Mind in the ether is no more unnatural than mind in the flesh and blood." But here again is the yet-unwarranted assumption that the mind is an entity over and beyond the body.

Of course this word "Ether" is a scientific term. Into it we put a content and a flavor that will keep it isolated for a time from religious ideas. That is because of the still surviving materialistic character of our thought and of the inflexible formalities which words impose on us. If we once get at the idea meant by the imperfect word-sign Ether, we will have reached a new, a deeper and a real "spiritual" understanding. Never before has there been any real basis for a spiritual conception of life or the universe. Former thought has been merely speculation and conclusion without an investigated, verified basis.

Samuel Calthrop, that rare speciman of a minister drawing his gospel from Science, had much to say about God from this point of view, and many of his thoughts are entirely new conceptions in the field of religion. In the "New World" for December, 1894, he wrote, "God has nothing but his own perfect substance to make worlds (and all that they contain) out of." "Matter, therefore,

is not only divine, but is the crowning act of the divine love and self-sacrifice. It is God giving away himself for man to use, to enjoy, to govern." (Notice that even in this masterpiece of religious statement there is still persistent the anthropomorphic apperception. He still applies to the Ether the attributes of man. He still fits out God with human dispositions.)

Farther on he says, God's children "are spirit because he is spirit. They live because he lives. They inherit into his love, his wisdom, his eternity. There is only one mind and they share it; only one lif eand in that life they live; only one spirit, and they are spirit. Verily, then, 'in him and of him and by him, we live and move and have our being'." "A God whom we may possibly approach in some far-off tomorrow is to give place to a God in whose bosom we rest, the presence of whose life and love we daily and hourly feel." "God, the ultimate fact and spirit, the sure foundation on which all things rest; this is the thought of the twentieth century, into which we of the nineteenth are just beginning to enter."

Yes, this comes near the thought of the twentieth century. But the thought of the twentieth century is a little stronger and a little keener than the incisive mind of Dr. Calthrop divined.

From all this, it is seen that "empty space is an empty phrase." Every place is full. The old idea of the "all-seeing God" means better the all-being God. As Hinton has said also, "God is seen to be no longer the cause of things, but the fact of things." Cause and effect, power and might, substance and space, phenomena and time, truth

and beauty, life and love are just modes of being. Some of them are probably modes of infinite being and others modes of finite being. They are not all merely consequences of divine action. Some of them we think are divine nature. **Things are manifestations of the divine, but the divine does not possess all the attributes of all the things, nor do things possess all the attributes of the divine.** Things grow, evolve, change. We do not think of God as growing or evolving, tho God does change. God is not the same forever, even tho some ancient Hebrew prophets boldly shouted it. Things are just so many finite visions of divine actions. God exists changing. These changes are just so much as we get into our consciousness of the divine phenomena. We can look nowhere and escape them. We are of them. But the visible Divine Phenomena are not all of the Divine Nature. And any attributes that we may ascribe to any of these phenomena do not necessarily apply to the whole Divine Nature. We cannot get away from the Divine, we cannot live without being a part of it; but the descriptions of our life and of other phenomena do not fit in any attempted description of the Divine Nature as a whole. We say that we are tall or short, adipose or thin, mechanical or clumsy, good or bad, wise or ignorant; but we cannot apply any of these to the Divine Nature. Men have during all time wrongly anthropomorphized their gods, and thus have kept themselves in moral surveilance and at the same time in intellectual perplexity. They have hindered themselves from solving the problems of Nature by insisting on seeing Nature's controlling power as existing in their own image. They will be com-

pelled to give this up. They will soon turn the moral interest and devotion which they have wasted on God toward human beings who infinitely need it. They will have a hard time in doing this. A few have tried it. Occasionally during the centuries someone sees this fact and breathes it out in sad despair. Long years ago Omar Khayyam, the Persian poet, in deep realization of the imperfect nature of Nature, said:

"Ah Love! could you and I with him conspire
To grasp this sorry scheme of things entire,
Would not we shatter it to bits—and then
Re-mold it nearer to the heart's desire!"

In his dark age, before Science brought its multitude of facts to busy and bless our lives, all existence seemed fate to the thinker. He had not the basic thoughts wherewith to interpret. He saw the contradicting facts, and knew not how to use them. Yet he saw the place where devotion should be centered. Let men return their thanks and lavish their love and admiration and service upon their human benefactors, upon the state, upon humanity,—upon all that lives and helps. Omar saw the childishness and the uselessness of thinking that man by a treaty, a prayer, or sacrifice could move the will of his forward working fate.

"The moving Finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on; nor all your piety and wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

And that inverted bowl they call the Sky,
Whereunder crawling coop'd we live and die,
  Lift not your hands to it for help—for it
As impotently rolls as you or I.

With earth's first clay they did the last man knead,
And thereof the last harvest sows the seed:
  And the first morning of creation wrote
What the last dawn of reckoning shall read.

What! out of senseless nothing to provoke
A conscious something to resent the yoke
  Of unpermitted pleasure, under pain
Of everlasting penalties, if broke!

What! from his helpless creature be repaid
Pure gold for what he lent us dross-allay'd—
  Sue for a debt we never did contract,
And cannot answer—Oh the sorry trade!

Oh Thou, who didst with pitfall and with gin
Beset the road I was to wander in,
  Thou wilt not with predestin'd evil round
Enmesh, and then impute my fall to sin!

Oh Thou, who man of baser earth didst make,
And ev'n with Paradise devise the Snake:
  For all the sin wherewith the face of man
Is blacken'd—Man's forgiveness give—and take!"

Six hundred years ago, or at any time before the nineteenth century, wise, indeed, was the man who could do better than this, if he meditated honestly and unprejudicedly on the great All of Life and Being. It was all a sorry, fated scheme before man had achieved enough to make his life worth while. To those who did not think, "worth-while" was not a problem. The tragedy comes in when the higher consciousness arrives. And that higher consciousness must solve its problems and reach its comfort thru contemplation and thru a service so complete that it removes the cause of pain; and in this must the newer, wiser humanity find its purpose and its comfort.

Nature is not a great man. Nature has not man's attributes. Nature does not contrive and plan and design. Nature does not make laws that become so many fates for man. Wise and good and angry and considerate apply no more to Nature than tall and white and bony and deaf. Nature is endless possibility and limitless being. Nature is basic condition for finite activity. Only at this later date in terrestrial evolution does here and there an organism reach the conscious realization that sees and feels and suffers because of the incongruities. And not to Nature, but to man's ingenuity and loving sense of justice must man look for relief. Man must build into the nature of things, man must so modify his environment that he shall make life what he could have wished life to have been. Man will continue to talk about and picture this Basic Condition of his being, but he will do it less in terms of himself. He will agonize for a time over the consequences. It is a pity that our age must suffer for the ideas

they were buncoed into learning. These age-long prejudices will long continue to warp our thought toward anthropomorphic forms. But as we escape from these prejudices, we will try the harder to redeem our life to the ideals which honest search and experience have impelled.

Man will never cease to wonder over the profundities of Nature. But the new adoration will vastly transcend the old. And when he gets used to it, it will be vastly more inspiring. He will quit his childish expectancy of help from without, and his self-acquired new facts will fill him with new purpose and new hope to bring about his blessings by his own co-operative efforts.

With simple minds, old terms alone produce pleasurable emotion. New terms have to be long used before they infuse the feelings which may replace the old. But it is nothing against the new expressions if the old prejudices do not approve. Man will be long in realizing the difficulties of his convictions. His very worst habit is reaction against the suggestion of change.

With a full consciousness that it is impossible to reach the feeling of today's most real religious need, and yet with an equally strong conviction that that religious need must be re-expressed, I have attempted to state in today's terms, today's idea of the Great Encompassing All.

ADORATION

Fount of worlds unfathomed! Energy eternal!
Realm and Potency and Law in living Cosmos, Thou;
Past or Present, all things—mote to star supernal,
E'en yet evolve in Thine unending Now.

Vibrant, radiant Glory! Darkness never hides Thee;
Face to face with Nature-laws is facing Deity;
Yet o'er realms so awful whelms Thy Being mighty,
Words ne'er can utter Thine Infinity.

All-dispensing World-Life! Every race adores Thee,
Finding Thee in rock or rill or in the smiling sky;
Bowing down in useless fear, over-awed before Thee;
Or lifting up their eyes in joy on high.

Nameless, baffling Presence! Omnipresence filling;
Yet forever, late and early, must we search for Thee;
Source of Power and Beauty; Ever lifting, thrilling!
GOD—folding all in wondrous unity.

A RECEIVERSHIP FOR CIVILIZATION

This book condenses a long study. Forty years ago the author began to believe that the White Civilization was approaching another crisis—greater than the decay of Rome at the oncoming of Christianity. The chief element in this approach toward decadence is the discovery of a new Cosmos by thinkers and investigators and the stubborn preaching of the old legendary outlook by those who assume to provide the theory of conduct. Thus we are threatened with seeing the bottom drop out of Civilization. **THE DEDICATION** furnishes the key to the purpose of the book:—

To Men of Religion, the World's former Trust, the time-honored source of goodness; **To Men of Science,** the World's new Hope, the modern fount of knowledge. May the one get the facts and the other the zeal that shall save their common charge—**Civilization.**

"This is a great book and one that should be pushed for the next 25 years."

—The Putnams, Publishers, New York.

"You are truly a great prophet. Your book will be to these times what the prophecies of old were to their time. It is the prophecy of a new day.

—Ben B. Lindsey, Judge of Juvenile Court, Denver.

The **NEW YORK HERALD** in a half-page article on "Religion and Modern Civilization" states, that over 50 books have lately appeared calling the world to see its imminent danger. It refers several times to and quotes much from the book entitled **"A Receivership for Civilization."** It says: "Of far wider appeal than those mentioned before is Dr. Ward's study, with its suggestive title. * * * It is a call to arms and an eloquent one—so much so that it disarms any minor criticism or exception to the details of his book. * * * The author has coined a very apt phrase, to cover the case, in the title of his **remarkable book."**

THE DENVER POST says: Not as infidel or agnostic, but as a devout believer in the universality of God, or life universal, Dr. Ward makes his survey of civilization.

A RECEIVERSHIP FOR CIVILIZATION

We entreat your careful attention to this warning book. It springs from a long study and a deep anxiety. It is both history and prophecy. Civilization must have a new moral basis. The Church, that has assumed to have directions from God as to how life should be lived, is not keeping up to date. Old Moral Sanctions have decayed. New ones must be collected. They abound in the literature of Science.

This Book Challenges Attention to

—Its Tribute to The Church of The Past.
—Its Pungent Epitome of Christianity.
—Its Portrayal of The Out-of-Date Preacher.
—Its Picture of The New-Time Preacher.
—Its Condensed Critique of the Old Bible.
—Its Synopsis of The New Bible.
—Its Clear-cut Remedy in Collegiate Preaching.
—Its Statement of The Clergy's Need of Science.
—Its Call to Men of Science to Come to The Rescue.
—Its Creed of Science—The Coming Outlook.
—Its Retrospect and Prospect of Aryan Civilization.

It Solves the Fundamentalist-Modernist Dispute

PUBLISHED BY
THE FOUR SEAS CO.
168 Dartmouth St.,
Boston, Mass.

WESTERN DISTRIBUTORS:
Up The Divide Pub. Co.,
958 Acoma St.,
Denver, Colo.

PRICE $3.50—OCTAVO VOLUME, CLOTH BINDING.

SPECIAL OFFER:—To those who order NOW, from the Western Distributors, price will be $3.00 postpaid.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

A TRIBUTE To The Christian Church.
PROLOG—The Diminishing Church. Why?
The Lines of Our Survey.

CHAPTERS

Part One—THE DRAMA OF CHRISTIANITY.
I. Epitome—The Five Great Acts.
II. The Beginning of Protest in Act III—Wiclif.
III. The Next Great Protest—Act IV—Luther.
IV. Protestantism—Its Essence and Limitations.
V. The Protest Movement—A Northern Race Awakening.
VI. The Making of Modern Times by Protest.

Part Two—THE GREATEST TRANSITION IN HUMAN HISTORY—Act V.
VII. The Latest Organized Protestantism.
VIII. The Unorganized Protest-ants.
IX. Resulting Changes in World Outlook.
X. The Old-Time Preacher 'mid the New Time Needs.
XI. The New-Time Preacher with the New-Time Facts.

Part Three—THE AUTHORITY OF FORMER TIMES.
XII. Beauties of the Old Bible.
XIII. Why Preach About the Bible?
XIV. "Higher Criticism and Its Great Discoveries."
XV. The Old Bible.
XVI. Inspiration, Revelation and Sacredness.

Part Four—THE SUBSTITUTED AUTHORITY OF SCIENCE.
XVII. The New Bible.
XVIII. The New Bible—Book I—Of The Heavens—Astronomy.
XIX. The New Bible—Book II—Of The Earth—Geology.

Part Five—THE "INSCRUTIBLE MYSTERIES" SOLVED.
XX. The Problem of Evil.
XXI. Moral Sanctions from Brute to Saint.
XXII. Prayer and Law and Common Sense.
XXIII. The Old Worship and The New.
XXIV. On The Divide.
XXV. Freedom—Religion—Church.

Part Six—A HIGHER EFFICIENCY HAILED.
XXVI. The Ought-To-Be Church.
XXVII. The New Ministry Must Develop New Methods.
XXVIII. Collegiate Preaching—The Way To Success.

Part Seven—RELIGIOUS RECONSTRUCTION URGENT.
XXIX. Scientific Doctrine and Method Imperative.
XXX. Sample Close ups of Thought Conditions.
XXXI. Reticence of Science Dangerous.
XXXII. If We Must Have a Creed—The Creed of Science.
RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT of Aryan Civilization.

PUBLICATIONS—PAST AND COMING

By DUREN J. H. WARD

OUT OF PRINT

Our Next Emancipation (The Temperance Movement).
How Religion Arises—A Psychological Study.
The Scientific Study of Religion.
Anthropology—A Syllabus of The Science.
A Scientist's Creed.
Government Ownership in 100 Principal Countries.
The Human Races and a New Classification.
Historico-Anthropological Possibilities in Iowa.
The Problem of The Mounds.
The Okoboji Mount—A Scientific Excavation.
Meskwakia and The Meskwaki Tribe.
The Classification of Religions.

ON THE MARKET

A Receivership for Civilization, $3.
Origin and Evolution of Christmas and New Year, 75c.
Education—The Surpassing Farce ,25c.
World Peace—By Natural Process, 25c.
Darwin and Evolution, 50c.
Science—Its Meaning and Goal, 25c.
Crime—Its Biology and Psychology, 50c.
The Origin of Mind—A Chapter in Anthropology, 50c.
The Modern God—Our Cosmic Background, $1.
The Biography of God—From Fetichism to Monism, $1.

WELL ON THE WAY

The Rise of Science—from Columbus to Spencer.
Nineteenth-Century Mile-Posts in Religious Doctrine.
The God—Whom Men Have Always Sought, but Only Lately Found.
Lectures on "Schooling" and "Education."
A Thumb-nail Autobiography—Re-estimating "Education" and "Success" long afterwards.
Ward-Varnum Genealogy—American Pioneers.
Letters to Future Ages—Asking Their Opinions on Our Affairs. (A new invention in Rhetoric)
Woman and World Affairs.
The Human Being—From Cell to Philosopher.
The Human Mind—Character Analysis on Biological Basis.
Anthropology—The Study of Human Origins.
Poems Inspired by Science—Mrs. Lizzie Cheney Ward.
Books—Our Greatest Help—Our Greatest Hindrance.

EXPERIENCE AND WRITINGS

By Duren J. H. Ward

A.B., A.M., B.D., Hillsdale;

A.M., Harvard; Ph.D., Leipsic.

Harvard Fellow in Europe two years.

See "Who's Who in America," 1914-1924.

District School, Dorchester, Ontario—(8 years).

High School, Memphis, Mich.—(3 years).

Graduate of Hillsdale College, A. B., A. M., B. D.—(5 years student)

Graduate of Harvard University, A. M.—(3 years).

Graduate Leipsic University, Ph. D.—(1 year).

Student at Berlin University—(1 year).

These ten years as College and University student covered a complete Teacher's Course, a Minister's Course, the greater part of a Medical Course, also much work in Philosophy and the Sciences of Biology, Ethnology, Anthropology, Psychology, Sociology and History.

Travelling Fellow of Harvard University for two years in Europe.

Among Former Teachers:

Harvard: James, Royce, Palmer, Everett, Peabody, Emerton, Gurney, Toy, Lyon.

Berlin: Paulsen, Virchow, Mendel, Du Bois Raymond, Zeller, Deussen, von Gizycki, Ebbinghaus, Hartmann.

Leipsic: Wundt, Heinze, Ratzel, Maurenbrecher, Schmidt.

Librarian six years while at Hillsdale and Harvard. Classified and directed the cataloguing of 29,000 volumes.

Experience in Teaching—12 years—

Country School. City School (Principal). Academy (Principal).
Model School (in New York City, Superintendent).
College (Hillsdale, Tutor; Kan. Agr. and Colo. Agr., Professor and Lecturer).
University (Harvard and Iowa, Lecturer).

Unitarian Minister, Dover, N. H.; Iowa City, Ia.; Fort Collins, Colo.

Extended experience in Printing Business and Publishing.

Studied Educational and Correctional Institutions in United States, Canada and Europe. Has managed Organizations and been Investigator, Teacher, Lecturer, Writer on various phases of Anthropology, Ethnology, Psychology, Sociology and Education.

Investigated Indian Mounds and the Musquakie Indians for the Iowa State Historical Society, of which the maps, measurements, statistics, survey and history were published in "Iowa Journal of History and Politics," 1902-1906 Remains collected now on permanent exhibition in Iowa State Historical Society Museum at State University, Iowa City.

Last sixteen years in Denver Writing and Lecturing on Special Fields of Science, Sociology, Psychology and History. From 1909-14, Editor of "Up the Divide," a Magazine advocating the methods, spirit and study of Modern Sciences.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICA
44 754 801

The Modern God

THE SCIENTIFIC STATEMENT

This Booklet is the gist of the most Modern Thought
Every Page is of vital and absorbing interest
A Wise Book with BIG IDEAS

CHAPTER HEADINGS:

—What is God?
—The Real God of Nature
—Where is God
—Is God a Person?

EXTRACTS FROM PREFACE:

The "Social Problem" is not merely the problem of "Freedom." It becomes evident also the problem of "Freedom." Christ it any and every Church Use, when it has become traditional, it is established and authorized, Liberty. One and all they have made toward absolute monarchy. But inasmuch as the increase of man's individuality, the manifestation of the idea of God becomes of great importance.

One and all, the Great Gods are being dethroned. Of course they never actually existed. They were only imagined creatures. But with their dethronement they have in their fall destroyed their "Heaven" perhaps and

BL 50 .W25	Ward Biography of God 740275
OCT 13 '37	William Ramsey Fifth University
MAY 1 '38 MAY 8 '38	W. E. Gordon 6032 Ellis Ave
AUG 5 '38	E. Land 6227 Woodlawn
JUL 16 '38 JUL 29 '38	C E Miller Fowler
AUG 26 '38 SEP 27 '38	J Hanna Gates Hall
MON 29 '38 DEC 7 '37	Hudson Driggs Judsons

BL
50
.W20

740275

Ward
Biography of God.

OCT 13 '27	Ramsey	OCT 18 '27
MAY 1 '28	W. E. Gladon	MAY 5 '28
AUG 3 '31	E. Lane	AUG 5 '31
JUL 16 '32	C E Miller	JUL 20 '32
AUG 26 '33	A Hand	SEP 27 '33
NOV 29 '35	Steyer	OCT 7 '37

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAG
44 754 801